

REMARKS

Favorable consideration and allowance of claims 17-22 and 25-32 are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 16, 23 and 24 were withdrawn from further consideration. By the present amendments, claims 16, 23 and 24 are cancelled without prejudice or any disclaimer of the subject matter therein.

Claims 17-22 and 25 were rejected as being anticipated by Endo et al. (U.S. 6,873,905). Applicants traverse the rejection as set forth below.

Claims 17 and 25 are amended to further define the features of transmitting and receiving the guide information in installments. Part of the guide information corresponds to guide information for the area of the recommended route near the start point and the other part corresponds to guide information for the remaining area. The amendments are supported by, for example, the first embodiment at page 12 et seq. and Fig. 32 and its relevant descriptions beginning at page 66, line 17. For example, in Fig. 32, route information is received in step S11 and then the guide information is requested in step S200 and received.

According to exemplary embodiments of the present invention, the route guidance may be started when the information terminal receives the part of the guide information including information for the area of the route near the start

point out of the guide information transmitted separately portion-by-portion from the information distribution center along with the route information that is transmitted in a batch. This arrangement provides advantages described, for example, at page 34 *et seq.* For example, based on the guide information size and the estimated download time indicated at a display monitor, a user is able to decide whether or not to receive the guide information in a split download (e.g., installments). "By opting for a split-download when the guide information size is large and the estimated download time is significant, the risk of an increased communication time due to a possible communication failure/retry that may occur during a batch download can be avoided, and the total length of time required for the download can be reduced." *Page 34, line 24 – page 35, line 4.*

Endo fails to teach or suggest transmission of, among the results of route search calculation or route guide information, the route information in a batch and the guide information separately portion-by-portion, i.e., in installments. With regard to step (b) of the method of claim 17, the Office Action refers to col. 14, line 52 – col. 15, line 4 of Endo. The cited excerpt, however, simply discloses transmitting route data in streams. By contrast, step (b) is "a step in which the information terminal transmits a request to the information distribution center to transmit the route guide information in installments." Transmitting route data in streams does not correspond to an information terminal transmitting a

request to an information distribution center to transmit route guide information in installments. Therefore, amended claim 17 is patentable over Endo.

With regard to step (c) of the method of claim 17, the Office Action refers to col. 21, line 44 – col. 22, line 40 of Endo. The cited excerpt describes the method illustrated in FIG. 31 of Endo. FIG. 31 and its description, however, fail to disclose the specific limitations of claim 17, which claims “a step in which upon receiving the request, the information distribution center extracts a portion of the guide information corresponding to an area of the recommended route near the start point and transmits the obtained route information in a batch and the extracted portion of the guide information.” Although the cited excerpt describes a method for downloading map data, it does not teach or suggest the specific limitations of step (c) of claim 17. Therefore, amended claim 17 is patentable over Endo for this additional reason.

Applicants submit that amended claim 25 is patentable for reasons analogous to those for claim 17.

Amended claims 18-22 are patentable at least because of their dependence from claim 17.

New claims 26-30 are added to further define the route guidance methods claimed in claims 17 and 25, respectively, and new claims 31-32 define navigation systems. Support for these new claims is present in the specification, for example, at page 6, line 16 – page 7, line 10 and page 20, line 24 – page 21,

line 9. Claims 26-30 are patentable due to their dependence from claims 17 and 25, respectively, and claims 31-32 are patentable because the prior art fails to teach or suggest all of their limitations.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #029267.56376US).

Respectfully submitted,

December 18, 2007



Jeffrey D. Sanok
Registration No. 32,169
Cameron W. Beddard
Registration No. 46,545

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
JDS:CWB:crr
4730931